UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,177	12/11/2001	Vij Rajarajan	MS167411.2/40062.147USU1	2710

27488 7590 08/10/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
KOROBOV, VITALI A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/014,177	RAJARAJAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vitali Korobov	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/19/06.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to an RCE filed on 02/21/2006. Claims 1, 5 and 13 were amended. Claims 1-26 are pending in this Office Action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. The applicant's submission filed on 12/20/2005 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised

of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-12 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the U. S. Patent No. 6,857,013 B2, issued to Ramberg et al., hereinafter Ramberg, in view of the U. S. Patent No. 6,681,232 issued to Sistanizadeh et al., hereinafter Sistanizadeh.

With respect to claim 1, Ramberg teaches a system for managing a plurality of resources comprising: a management module in communication with the plurality of resources (Col. 4, lines 35 – 38 - plurality of the ADC device platforms); the management module capable of receiving a request to access information related to one or more of the plurality of resources (Col. 4, lines 29 – 33 for the platform and col. 4, lines 41 – 45 for a particular element of the platform); and in response to the receipt of a request to access information, the management module accesses information from more than one resource (Col. 4, lines 29 – 33, where the platform consist of plurality of elements).

Ramberg does not explicitly teach a system wherein the plurality of resources comprises one or more resources of differing type.

However, Sistanizadeh in analogous art, related to network management, teaches a system wherein the plurality of resources comprise one or more resources of

differing type (Fig. 2, showing differing types of resources. See also col. 10, lines 58-61).

Sistanizade also teaches a system wherein one or more resources manages one or more objects, and one or more object are managed by two or more resources (Col. 2, lines 39-52, the limitation of an object is met by a network database, managed (updated) by two or more agents in the network).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the configuration and query capabilities of Ramberg with plurality of resource types taught by Sistanizadeh. One having ordinary skills in the art would be motivated to combine the teaching of Ramberg and Sistanizadeh in order to provide additional network reliability, security, resource availability, network configuration flexibility and service profile manageability for a plurality of resource types (Sistanizadeh, col. 1, lines 63-67). Modified in this manner Ramberg is hereinafter referred to as modified Ramberg.

With respect to claim 2, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 1 wherein the management module comprises a configuration manager for receiving information from a plurality of resources and a configuration store for storing predetermined information for the plurality of resources (Col. 6, lines 51 – 54).

With respect to claim 3, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 2 wherein the configuration manager installs resources such that the management module can modify configuration information for the plurality of resources (Col. 6, lines 32 – 35).

With respect to claim 4, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 3 wherein each of the plurality of resources provides information to the configuration manager in XML format (Col. 9, lines 51 – 54).

With respect to claim 5, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 1 wherein each object comprises: one or more attributes, each attribute having a data field and a value (Col. 6, lines 51 – 54); one or more associated tasks that may be performed on the object; and wherein the management module accesses attribute and task information from the associated resources in response to a request to access information (Col. 4, lines 18 – 22).

With respect to claim 6, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 5 wherein the attribute information for an object is provided by more than one resource (Col. 4, lines 29 – 33; ADC device platform can comprise many individual ADC devices).

With respect to claim 7, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 6 wherein each object is defined by a property sheet and the attribute information is a property page in the property sheet (Fig. 9, diagnostic and repair sheet 901, incorporating property page for a particular unit 902).

With respect to claim 8, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 6 wherein the task information for an object is provided by more than one resource (Col. 4, lines 29 – 33, i.e. information in response to a status check (task) is provided by the ADC platform, comprising a plurality of units (resources)).

With respect to claim 9, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 6 wherein each object is defined by a property sheet and the task information is in a

property page associated with the property sheet (Fig. 8A, 8B and 9 – configurable message with pre-defined fields ("property sheet", as per pages 30, 31 of instant application) has tasks associated with it ("Help", "Next", "Send", etc.) and a property page pointer 902 associated with a particular unit).

With respect to claim 10, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 6 further comprising: a configuration manager for receiving and storing information from a plurality of resources relating to managed objects (Col. 7, lines 63 – 65, "Get" operation – receiving, MIB - storage); and a property sheet manager for receiving and storing property sheet information related to managed objects (Col. 6, lines 51 – 64, MIB and GUI).

With respect to claim 11, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 1 further comprising: a configuration manager for receiving information from a plurality of resources (Col. 4, lines 10 – 13), each resource having associated objects (Col. 4, lines 10 – 13); a configuration store for storing predetermined information for the plurality of resources (Col. 6, lines 51 – 54); and a search manager adapted to receive predetermined search information from a plurality of resources (Col. 14, lines 42 – 49).

Ramberg does not explicitly teach a search data store adapted to store predetermined search information for the various resources; and wherein the search manager searches the plurality of resources in response to a single search request.

Sistanizadeh on the other hand teaches a search data store adapted to store predetermined search information for the various resources (Col. 2, lines 39-42 - topology, service and customer information databases); and wherein the search

manager searches the plurality of resources in response to a single search request (Col. 16, lines 51-55 - single "GET" retrieves multiple objects (resource) variables).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the configuration and query capabilities of Ramberg with plurality of resource types taught by Sistanizadeh. One having ordinary skills in the art would be motivated to combine the teaching of Ramberg and Sistanizadeh in order to provide additional network reliability, security, resource availability, network configuration flexibility and service profile manageability for a plurality of resource types (Sistanizadeh, col. 1, lines 63-67).

With respect to claim 12, modified Ramberg teaches a system as defined in claim 1 wherein the management layer further comprises: a configuration manager for receiving information from a plurality of resources (Col 7, lines 63 – 64, "Get" operation), each resource having associated objects (Col. 4, lines 13 – 16); a configuration store for storing predetermined information for the plurality of resources (Col. 6, line 46 - 54; and a task manager, wherein the task manager receives task information from the configuration manager related to tasks that may be completed in managing the plurality of resources (Col. 7, lines 63 – 65).

With respect to claim 26, modified Ramberg teaches the system of claim 1.

Ramberg does not explicitly teach said system wherein the plurality of resources comprises one of printer, workstation, server, databases, security systems, email account, or user account.

However, Sistanizadeh teaches such system wherein the plurality of resources comprises one of printer, workstation, server, databases, security systems, email account, or user account (Fig. 2, showing differing types of resources. Fig. 4 shows server and user network workstations. See also col. 10, lines 58-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the configuration and query capabilities of Ramberg with plurality of resource types taught by Sistanizadeh. One having ordinary skills in the art would be motivated to combine the teaching of Ramberg and Sistanizadeh in order to provide additional network reliability, security, resource availability, network configuration flexibility and service profile manageability for a plurality of resource types (Sistanizadeh, col. 1, lines 63-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 13 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,754,885 B1 by Dardinski et al. (hereinafter Dardinski).

With respect to claim 13, Dardinski teaches a method of managing a plurality of resources, each resource having one or more managed objects, wherein each of the one or more managed objects has associated attribute and task information (Fig. 63, Group and User attributes, and Permissions to perform certain tasks), the method comprising: receiving information from a first resource related to attribute information for a first managed object (Col. 69, lines 7–16, and Fig. 65, first managed object – Loop, receives attribute information from the first resource); receiving information from a second resource related to attribute information for the first managed object, wherein the second resource is a different type than the first resource (Col. 69, lines 7-16, where Dardinski teaches, that the attributes for the object can be established at any level, (for example, User, which is a different type of a resource than a Group resource); storing the information received from the second resource with the information received from the first resource in association with the first managed object (Col. 69, lines 7-16 and Fig. 65 - Groups, Users, Object Types and Permissions); receiving a request to access information related to the first managed object; and upon receiving the request to access information related to the first managed object, accessing information stored by the first resource and separately stored by the second resource to access information related to the first managed object (Fig. 65 - Groups, Users, Object Types and Permissions. Group, User and Permission tabs).

With respect to claim 14, Dardinski teaches a method as defined in claim 13 wherein the information received from the first resource comprises a first property page (Fig. 63 – 64 – User tab) and wherein the information received from the second

resource comprises a second property page (Fig. 63 – 64 – Group tab) and wherein the method further comprises: creating a property sheet for the first managed object Col. 68, lines 55 – 58); associating the first property page with the property sheet (Fig. 63, Users property page); and associating the second property page with the property sheet (Fig. 63 – 64 – Group property sheet; col. 68, lines 64 – 67 associating first property page with second property page).

With respect to claim 15, Dardinski teaches a method as defined in claim 14 further comprising: receiving a search request from a client computer system; and searching a plurality of resources in response to the single search request using information associated with the property sheet (Col. 45, lines 63 – 65).

With respect to claim 16, Dardinski teaches a method as defined in claim 15 further comprising the act of sharing search information between resources (Col. 46, lines 22 – 24).

With respect to claim 17, Dardinski teaches a method as defined in claim 14 further comprising: receiving a task request from a client computer system Fig. 1, workstation 11); and in response to the task request, requesting task completion from a plurality of resources (Fig. 1, plurality of resources 10A, 10B, 12, 14, 16).

With respect to claim 18, Dardinski teaches a method as defined in claim 17 wherein the act of requesting task completion from a plurality of resources comprises: identifying two or more resources to configure in response to the task request (Col. 8, lines 35 – 38); and performing the task by accessing the two or more resources identified to perform a task from a client's computer system (Col. 8, lines 50 – 59).

With respect to claim 19, Dardinski teaches a method as defined in claim 13 wherein the act of receiving information from the first and second resources is performed by a configuration manager and wherein the method further comprises: notifying a search manager that search information has been received (Col. 45, lines 65 – 67).

With respect to claim 20, Dardinski teaches a method as defined in claim 13 wherein the act of receiving information from the first and second resources is performed by a configuration manager and wherein the method further comprises: notifying a task manager that search information has been received (Col. 46, lines 3 – 5).

Claim 21 is rejected in view of the above rejection of claim 13. Claim 21 is essentially the same as claim 13, except that it sets forth the invention as a computer program product rather than a method, as does claim 13.

Claim 22 is rejected in view of the above rejection of claim 17. Claim 22 is essentially the same as claim 17, except that it sets forth the invention as a computer program product rather than a method, as does claim 17.

Claim 23 is rejected in view of the above rejection of claim 18. Claim 23 is essentially the same as claim 18, except that it sets forth the invention as a computer program product rather than a method, as does claim 18.

With respect to claim 24, Dardinski teaches a computer program product readable by a computer and having stored thereon a data structure comprising information provided by a first resource relating to attribute information for a first

managed object and information provided by a second resource relating to attribute information for the first managed object, wherein the attribute information is utilized in response to a request for information about the first managed object (Fig. 63, hierarchical data structure for Groups and Users).

With respect to claim 25, Dardinski teaches a computer program product as defined in claim 24 wherein the data structure further comprises task information provided by the first and second resources utilized in response to a request for information about the first managed object (Fig. 63, Permissions property page for Groups and Users).

6. **Examiner's note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/20/2005 with respect to claims 1-26 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicants argue – ***"Ramberg does not include the same elements as amended claim 1, i.e., one or more resources that manage one or more objects."***

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In order to meet this limitation, the reference need to have just one object managed by just one resource, and Ramberg certainly teaches that (See, for example, col. 3, lines 36-37 and Fig. 1).

The Applicants argue – ***"The ADC devices, i.e., the resources, do not manage the information."***

The Examiner respectfully submits that management of information by resources is not claimed in Claim 1, or any of the dependent claims. Resources are claimed to manage objects, and the information is claimed to be managed by the management module.

The Applicants argue - ***"Ramberg also does not contain "objects" that are the same or similar to the objects claimed in amended claim 1. The "objects," in embodiments of the present invention, are information about or for an entity that uses the resource, which may not include information about the resource itself".***

The Examiner respectfully submits that the amended claim 1 does not have any limitations directed to what the objects are, or that the objects are information about or for an entity that uses the resource, which may not include information about the resource itself.

The Applicants argue - ***"The ADC resource information about the functioning of the ADC devices is not the same as information about entities that may employ the resource."***

The Examiner respectfully submits that there is nothing in the claim 1 or in any of the dependent claims regarding information about entities that may employ the resource.

The Applicants argue - ***"The most significant difference between Ramberg and amended claim 1 is that two or more resources do not manage a single piece***

of ADC information or any single object in Ramberg", and provides a reference to the specification.

The Examiner respectfully reminds the Applicants that claimed subject matter, not the specification is the measure of the invention. Disclosure contained in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding prior art. In re Sporck, 55 CCPA 743, 386 F .2d 924, 155 USPQ 687 (1986); In re Self, 213 USPQ 1, 5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11, 15 (CCPA 1978).

Further, this limitation is met by Sistanizade, who teaches a system wherein one or more resources manages one or more objects, and one or more object are managed by two or more resources (Col. 2, lines 39-52, the limitation of an object is met by a network database, managed (updated) by two or more agents in the network).

The Applicants argue - ***"As such, the SLM manages the object or information and not the resources. Likewise, no resource manages one or more objects and two or more resources do not manage any single object. Simply, Sistanizadeh does not describe the limitations of amended claim 1".***

The Examiner respectfully disagrees and refers the Applicants to the above rejection of claim 1, stating that this limitation is met by Sistanizade, who teaches a system wherein one or more resources manages one or more objects, and one or more object are managed by two or more resources (Col. 2, lines 39-52, the limitation of an object is met by a network database, managed (updated) by two or more agents in the network).

With respect to the rejections of claims 13-25, the Applicants argue - ***"Dardinski does not disclose each and every element of amended claim 13, i.e., Dardinski does not describe accessing information stored by the first resource and separately stored by the second resource when accessing the object."***

The Examiner respectfully points out that no access of the object is claimed. What the relevant limitation of claim 13 is directed to is accessing of information related to the first managed object, which is different from accessing the object itself.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is reminded that in amending in response to a rejection of claims, the patentable novelty must be clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and the objection made. Applicant must show how the amendments avoid such references and objections. See 37 CFR § 1.111(c).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vitali Korobov whose telephone number is 571-272-7506. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday 8a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vitali Korobov
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

08/07/2006
VAK

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER